UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,009	02/27/2002	Alan Rubinstein	3COM-3720 .BCG.US.P	1061

7590 01/12/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER	
JEAN GILLES, JUDE	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2143	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/086,009	RUBINSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jude J. Jean-Gilles	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 December 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 02/27/02. Claimed Priority is granted from provisional application **60/277593** with a priority filing date: 03/20/01

Response to Amendment after Final

1. This action is responsive to the RCE application filed on 12/12/2005. There are no amendment to the claims. There are no newly added claims. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-26 represent a method and apparatus for a "secure network outlet for supporting IP Device address assigning functionality".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhatia et al (Bhatia), U.S. Patent No. 6,028,848) in view of Terry U.S. Publication No. 2001/0036199.

Regarding claim 1: Bhatia discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Bhatia teaches a method for performing device address assigning functionality in intelligent

hardware (see Bhatia; fig. 1, item 300, column 10, lines 10-30), said method comprising:

receiving a network access request from an electronic device communicatively coupled to said intelligent hardware (see Bhatia; column 4, lines 52-67; column 5, lines 1-10);

transmitting a device address request to a network server communicatively coupled to said intelligent hardware (see Bhatia; column 4, lines 52-67,. column 5, lines 1-35); however Bhatia does not disclose in details the steps of:

receiving a first device address from said network server communicatively coupled to said intelligent hardware; and assigning a second device address to said electronic device communicatively coupled to said intelligent hardware; wherein the said intelligent hardware is wall-mountable and comprises a user-accessible surface such that a user is provided direct access to said intelligent hardware (see Bhatia; fig. 1; item 300) Note that this intelligent device is an external MODEM and all external MODEMS are inherently wall-mountable).

In the same field of endeavor, Terry discloses "The field-trial version of the hub with protocol converter is supported by a PC motherboard and is packaged, together with the central modem RF board, in a PC rack-mount, pizza box sized case, for wall mounting. This PC motherboard, upon booting, makes a DHCP request via its Cable modem to a server in the headend and receives a leased IP address--just like a user-PC provided with regular Cable modem service. If the hub with protocol converter has multiple Cable modem connections to the headend then this action is repeated for each Cable modem. The many client-PC's are be made to appear, from a headend service management perspective, as

though they are connected via individual Cable modems. Thus a function is provided in the headend that collects associated user-PC MAC and assigned IP address information from the protocol converter and presents this as an interface to Internet Headend service management 120 that also manages single-user Cable Modem services..."[see Terry, paragraphs 0034-0035]

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Terry's teachings of using an intelligent hardware such as a hub with protocol converter to receive and assign addresses with the teachings of Bhatia, for the purpose of improving the ability of a network "... *to not only substantially eliminate user frustration and significantly reduce time and costs associated with establishing, configuring and using a LAN for a workgroup as well as with connecting each PC therein to a remote network service provider, but also increase the use of such LANs in small businesses and among home users to the eventual benefit of each.*" as stated by Bhatia in lines 25-33 of column 4. By this rationale, **claim 1** is rejected.

Regarding claim 2, The combination Bhatia-Terry teaches a method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said intelligent hardware comprises:

a first interface for communicatively coupling said intelligent hardware to a network, said network comprising said network server (see Bhatia; see Bhatia; fig. 1, item 305,. column 10, lines 31-56);

a second interface for communicatively coupling said intelligent hardware to a plurality of said electronic devices such that each said electronic device is communicatively coupled to said network (see Bhatia; see Bhatia; fig. 1, items 34; column 10, lines 22-44),

a processor coupled to said first interface and said second interface (see Bhatia; see Bhatia; 5g. 1, items 330,. column 14, lines 15-67); and

a device address retriever coupled to said processor (see Bhatia; column 1 7, lines 43-67, column 18, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 3, Bhatia teaches a method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said first device address and said second device address are an IP addresses (see Bhatia; column 12, lines 1-40).

Regarding claim 4, Bhatia teaches a method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said network server comprises a DHCP server (see Bhatia; column 1 7, lines 42-67; fig. 4B, item 408).

Regarding claim 5, Bhatia teaches a method as recited in claim 1 wherein said first device address is the same as said second device address (see Bhatia; column 12, lines 1-40).

Regarding claim 6, Bhatia teaches a method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said first device address is a global device address (see Bhatia; column 5, lines 15-60; note that the Public Address of the workstation is the global address of the device).

Regarding claim 7, Bhatia teaches a method as recited in Claim 1 wherein said second device address is a private device address (see Bhatia; column 5, lines 15-60; note that the

Private Address of the workstation is the private address of the device).

Regarding claim 8, Bhatia teaches a method for performing device address

assigning functionality in intelligent hardware (see Bhatia; fig. 1, item 30; column 10, lines 10-30),

said method comprising:

receiving a network access request from an electronic device communicatively coupled to said intelligent hardware, said intelligent hardware having a first device address (see Bhatia; column 4, lines 52-67,. column 5, lines 1-5) wherein the said intelligent hardware is wall-mountable and comprises a user-accessible surface such that a user is provided direct access to said intelligent hardware; and

assigning a second device address to said electronic device communicatively coupled to said intelligent hardware, such that said intelligent hardware eliminates the need for a separate device address assigning server (see Bhatia; column 5, lines 10-35,. column 11, lines 64-67,. column 12, lines 1-40).

Regarding claim 15, Bhatia teaches an intelligent device for performing device address assigning functionality comprising:

a wall-mountable housing (see Bhatia; fig. 1; item 300) Note that this intelligent device is an external MODEM and all external MODEMS are inherently wall-mountable);

a first interface for communicatively coupling said intelligent device to a network (see Bhatia; fig. 1, item 305,. column 10, lines 31-56),

a second interface for communicatively coupling said intelligent device to a plurality of electronic devices such that each said electronic device is

communicatively coupled to said network (see Bhatia; fig. 1, items 340,. column 10, lines 22-44) wherein the said second interface is comprised within a user-accessible surface such that a user is provided direct access to said intelligent hardware (see Bhatia; fig. 1, items 305;column 10, 1-67);

a processor coupled to said first interface and said second interface (see Bhatia; fig. 1, items

33) column 14, lines 15-67); and

a device address retriever coupled to said processor for retrieving a first device address for said intelligent device from a network server of said network and for assigning a second device address to said electronic device

wherein said first interface, said processor and said device address retriever are comprised within said wall-mountable housing (see Bhatia; fig. 1, items 300, 305, 350, 310, 330; column 1 7, lines 43-67; column 18, lines 1-44; fig. 3, items 350, 330).

Regarding claim 21, Bhatia teaches an intelligent device for deforming device address assigning functionality, said intelligent device having a first device address, said intelligent device comprising :

a first interface for communicatively coupling said intelligent device to a network (see Bhatia; fig. 1, item 305,. column 1 0, lines 31-56);

a second interface for communicatively coupling said intelligent device to a plurality of electronic devices such that each said electronic device is communicatively coupled to said network (see Bhatia; 5g. 1, items 340,. column 10, lines 22-

44) wherein said second interface is comprised within a user-accessible surface such that a user is provided direct access to said intelligent hardware (see Bhatia; fig. 3, items 350);

a processor coupled to said first interface and said second interface (see Bhatia; fig. 1, items

330; column 14, lines 15-67); and

a device address assignor coupled to said processor for assigning a second device address to said electronic device (see Bhatia; column 5, lines 10-67).

Wherein said first interface, said second interface, said processor and said device address retriever are comprised within said wall-mountable housing (see Bhatia; fig. 3, items 350, 330).

Regarding claim 9: Claim 9 lists all the same elements of claim 2, but in a different form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 2 applies equally as well to claim 9.

Regarding claims 10, 16, and 22: Claims 10, 16, and 22 list all the same elements of claim 3, but in a different form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 3 applies equally as well to claims 10, 16, and 22.

Regarding claims 11, 17, and 23: Claims 11, 17, and 23 list all the same elements of claim 4, but in a different form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 4 applies equally as well to 11, 17, and 23.

Regarding claims 12, 18, and 24: Claims 12, 18, and 24 list all the same elements of claim 5, but in a different form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the

rejection to claim 5 applies equally as well to 12, 18, and 24.

Regarding claims 13, 19, and 25: Claims 13, 19, and 25 list all the same elements of claim 6, but in a different form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 6 applies equally as well to 13, 19, and 25.

Regarding claims 14, 20, and 26: Claims 14, 20, and 26 list all the same elements of claim 7, but in a different form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 7 applies equally as well to 14, 20, and 26.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(see Bhatia; s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE NON-FINAL**. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (see Bhatia; 571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (see Bhatia; 571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (see Bhatia; 571) 272-9000.

Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

JJG

January 06, 2006